



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,400	10/07/2003	Lakshmi Narayanan	14846-28	5811

7590 01/11/2007  
MICHAEL B. JOHANNESSEN, ESQ.  
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER, P.C.  
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE  
ROSELAND, NJ 07068

EXAMINER
----------

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/680,400

Applicant(s)

NARAYANAN, LAKSHMI

Examiner

Jenise E. Jackson

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.

2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20031007.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiners et al.(2004/0148259) in view of Shaw(20040068559).

3. As per claim 1, Reiners et al. discloses a method for effecting controlled access to a privileged account on a computer system[0020] logging into an account with a user id and an account name[0034]; determining whether the account name is in a list of privileged account names and allowing access to the account if the account name is not in the privileged account list; determining whether the user id is in a list of user ids having permission to access privileged accounts and allowing access to the account if the user id is in the list of user ids having permission to access privileged accounts[0109]; recording a reason for accessing the account[0020, 0021]; notifying a manager of the privileged account of the login[0034]; terminating the login; and notifying the manager of the privileged account of the login termination[0116]. Reiners does not disclose recording keystrokes in a log file while logged into the account. Shaw discloses recording keystrokes in a log file[0009, 0024]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Shaw's recording keystrokes in a log file, with Reiners method of providing access control to account holder's such as internet banking accounts, the motivation to include recording keystrokes in a

Art Unit: 2131.

log file is that recording keystrokes is a security measure for detecting unauthorized computer usage, by monitoring users Internet activities[0007 of Shaw]. This method of Shaw is an efficient security measure for ensuring that banking account of Reiners are monitored for illegal activity.

As per claim 2, Shaw discloses determining whether the log file[0029-0030] is tampered with; and terminating the login in response to determining that the log file is tampered with[0009]. It would have been obvious to include the terminating of the log file of Shaw with Reiners, Shaw discloses the log file contains all internet activity of a user, the motivation to terminate the log file if tampering is detected, is that terminating the file based upon tampering is an efficient method of deleting the file from corruption.

5. Same Motivation as claim 2 above. As per claim 3, Shaw discloses denying write permission to the log file after the step of terminating the login[0009].

6. As per claim 4, Shaw discloses recording keystrokes while accessing the account in a duplicate log file[0009, 0024]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Shaw's recording keystrokes in a log file, with Reiners method of providing access control to account holder's such as internet banking accounts, the motivation to include recording keystrokes in a log file is that recording keystrokes is a security measure for detecting unauthorized computer usage, by monitoring users Internet activities[0007 of Shaw]. This method of Shaw is an efficient security measure for ensuring that banking account of Reiners are monitored for illegal activity.

7. As per claim 5, Shaw discloses determining whether the log file is tamped with; terminating the login and transmitting the duplicate file in response to determining that the log

Art Unit: 2131

file is tampered with[0009, 0029-0030]. It would have been obvious to include the terminating of the log file of Shaw with Reiners, Shaw discloses the log file contains all internet activity of a user, the motivation to terminate the log file if tampering is detected, is that terminating the file based upon tampering is an efficient method of deleting the file from corruption.

8. As per claim 6, Reiners discloses an account manager[0034]. Reiners does not disclose a log file. Shaw discloses a log file[see fig. 5 sheet 5]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit the log file of Shaw to Reiners account manager, because the log file records all internet activity[0007], thus transmitting the log file to the account manager of Reiners insures that the account manager has a record of all internet activity of a user in a file.

9. As per claim 7, Reiners discloses entering a password in order to access the privileged account[0034]; determining whether the password associated with the user id matches the entered password; and permitting access only if the password associated with the user id matches the entered password[0109].

10. As per claim 8, Reiners discloses notifying the manager of the privileged account if the login is not successful[0143].

Same Motivation as claim 5 above. As per claim 9, Shaw discloses compressing the log file after terminating the login[0020, 0029-0030].

12. As per claim 10, Shaw discloses recording keystrokes while accessing the account in a duplicate log file; deleting the duplicate log file responsive to a determination that the log file has not been tampered with[0009, 0029-0030]. It would have been obvious to include the terminating of the log file of Shaw with Reiners, Shaw discloses the log file contains all internet

Art Unit: 2131

activity of a user, the motivation to terminate the log file if tampering is detected, is that terminating the file based upon tampering is an efficient method of deleting the file from corruption.


### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E. Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
January 3, 2007

Taghi T. Arane  
Primary Examiner  
T. T. Arane  
1/7/06